

Appl No.: 10/630,004  
Reply to Office Action of July 27, 2004

### REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request that the term of response to the Office action be extended one month pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136 by payment of the required fee (attached is the duplicate copy of a deposit account fee sheet authorization).

#### Claim rejection

Claims 1, 2, 7 and 15, 16, 22 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 2, 3 and 15, 16, 17, respectively, of US patent No. 5,510, 716.

Claims 1, 2 and 15, 16 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 7, 8 and 1, 2, respectively, of US patent No. 5,900, 726.

Claims 4-6, 8-14, 18-21 and 23-27 are objected to as being independent upon rejected base claim.

In order to overcome the double patenting rejection of claims 2, 7, 15, 16, 22, Applicants file the two terminal disclaimers herewith enclosed. The rejection of claims 2, 7, 15, 16, 22 is therefore moot.

If any other fee is due in connection with the filing of this Response than for the extension of the reply term, Applicants hereby provide authorization to charge deposit account number 03-2316 for such fees.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 11/18/2004

By 

Edna M. O'Connor  
Reg. No. 29252  
(303) 231-4132